

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 through 32, 34 through 66, and 68 through 75 are currently pending in the application.

Claims 32, 34 through 36, 66, and 68 through 70 stand rejected.

Claims 1 through 31, 37 through 65, and 71 through 75 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention.

This amendment is in response to the Final Rejection of the pending claims in the Office Action of December 27, 2006.

**35 U.S.C. § 112 Claim Rejections**

Claims 32, 34 through 36, 66, and 68 through 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Applicants have amended the claimed invention for the presently claimed invention to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention to comply with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Applicants assert that the claimed inventions set forth in presently amended independent claims 32 and 66 are clearly set forth in the specification, at least, in specification paragraphs numbered [0008] and [0029]. Therefore, presently amended claims 32, 34 through 36, 66, and 68 through 70 are allowable under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections**

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent 5,809,987 to Wark et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,006,739 to Akram et al.

Claims 32, 34 through 36, 66, and 68 through 70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wark et al. (U.S. Patent 5,809,987) in view of Akram et al. (U.S. Patent 6,006,739). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

M.P.E.P. 706.02(j) sets forth the standard for a Section 103(a) rejection:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, **the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.** The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). (Emphasis added).

After carefully considering the cited prior art, the rejections, and the Examiner's comments, Applicants have amended the claimed invention to clearly distinguish over the cited prior art.

Applicants assert that any combination of the Wark et al. reference in view of the Akram et al. reference does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 regarding the claimed inventions of presently amended independent claims 32 and 66 because any combination of the Wark et al. reference in view of the Akram et al. reference does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the claimed inventions.

Turning to the cited prior art, the Wark et al. reference teaches or suggests a wafer cutting chuck used with a wafer cutting blade for cutting a semiconductor wafer into dice by dicing the wafer along the street indices.

The Akram et al. reference teaches or suggests a wafer saw having one or two blades including variable lateral indexing capabilities.

Applicants assert that any combination of the Wark et al. reference in view of the Akram et al. reference does not teach or suggest the claim limitations of the claimed inventions of presently amended independent claims 32 and 66 calling for "supporting at least one semiconductor device on a portion of the chuck such that at least two of said plurality of cutting pedestals partially supports a portion of said substrate; applying a vacuum through at least two cutting pedestals to a portion of the at least one semiconductor device supported on a portion of the at least two cutting pedestals of the chuck predisposing said portion of the at least one semiconductor device to remain in contact with said at least one cutting pedestal; sawing at least

one semiconductor device from said substrate; and sawing at least one other semiconductor device from said substrate by laterally indexing of the saw using one of a fixed interval comprising a multiple of an interval and a variable interval comprising an unrelated varying distance” and “supporting at least one semiconductor device on a portion of the chuck such that said plurality of cutting pedestals partially supports a portion of said substrate; applying a vacuum through the plurality of cutting pedestals to at least a portion of the at least one semiconductor device supported on a portion of the plurality of cutting pedestals of the chuck predisposing said portion of the at least one semiconductor device to remain in contact with said plurality of cutting pedestals; sawing at least one semiconductor device from said substrate; and sawing at least one other semiconductor device from said substrate by laterally indexing of the saw using one of a fixed interval comprising a multiple of an interval and a variable interval comprising an unrelated varying distance”. Applicants assert that neither the Wark et al. reference nor the Akram et al. reference nor any combination of the Wark et al. reference and the Akram et al. reference contains any description whatsoever regarding such elements of the presently claimed inventions. At best, Applicants assert that the Wark et al. reference saws semiconductor devices using a multiple of one to index the saw to the next street on the wafer while Akram et al. reference saws semiconductor devices using a varying index. Therefore, presently amended independent claims 32 and 66 are allowable as well as dependent claims 34 through 36 and 68 through 70 therefrom respectively.

Applicants submit that claims 32, 34 through 36, 66, and 68 through 70 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art and under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Applicants request the allowance of claims 32, 34 through 36, 66, and 68 through 70 and the case passed for issue.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "James R. Duzan". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "James" and last name "Duzan" clearly distinguishable.

James R. Duzan  
Registration No. 28,393  
Attorney for Applicants  
TRASKBRITT  
P.O. Box 2550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550  
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: February 23, 2007  
JRD/djp:lmh  
Document in ProLaw